



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/034,782

12/27/2001

Lisa M. Parker

580755.003

9050

27910

7590

04/02/2003

STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP  
ATTN: PATENT GROUP  
1201 WALNUT STREET, SUITE 2800  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64106-2150

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, TEENA KAY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3761

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,782

Applicant(s)

PARKER ET AL.

Examiner

Teena K Mitchell

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-16,23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 10 February 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 02/10/03 has been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thornton (6,405,729) in view of Goldstein (6,012,455).**

Thornton in a method for preventing air leakage during nasal continuous positive airflow pressure treatment discloses: applying a nasal flange (26, 30) to the user's nose, wherein said nasal flange is affixed to an air source (Col. 7, lines 44-67); and inserting a mouthpiece into the user's mouth (10) wherein said mouthpiece (10) is configured to prevent air from leaking out of the user's mouth (via venting seal 24).

While Thornton discloses a mask (60) he does not specifically disclose the venting seal (24) in use with the mask (60), however, he does disclose the venting seal with the nasal flange. However, to the extent if any that the nasal flange of Thornton may not be readable on a mask, resort is had to Goldstein, in a nasal continuous positive airflow pressure device, who teaches a mask (158) in use with a nasal flange (Figs. 19 and 20) providing a seal which fits around the nostrils and seals around the nose and upper lip close to the nostrils (Col. 6, lines 16-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the nasal flange of Thornton to employ any well-known mask for use with a nasal flange, doing so would have provided a means to provide a seal which fits around the nostrils and seals around the nose and upper lip close to the nostrils including the mask taught by Goldstein for use with a nasal flange.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 2-16 and 23 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 18-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The overall combination of the mouthpiece of claim 23 and the limitation of the flexible disk configured to fit between a user's teeth and lips, and to adhere to the interior of the user's lips, cheeks or a combination thereof to seal the user's mouth is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art of record.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The balance of art is cited to show mouthpiece devices and venting seals.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Teena K Mitchell whose telephone number is (703) 308-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.

Art Unit: 3761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (703) 308-1957. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

  
Teena Mitchell  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3761  
March 29, 2003